

and I was again discharged. I was again appointed in 1885 and sent with a detachment to Lyttelton, which was afterwards turned into an Artillery corps; and I was not again appointed to the Police Force until June, 1890. My grievance is: (1) That I joined the New Zealand Police Force before I was twenty-one years of age; that my conduct and ability was sufficiently good to insure my advancement ere this time to a reasonable position and standing in the Force had I not been discharged both wrongfully and on reduction, through no fault of my own; (2) that even admitting I were guilty of an error of judgment or other slight irregularity, ought that to have been sufficient to discharge a man who during the four previous years had borne a good character? (3) that I now find myself, after a lapse of over fifteen years, in receipt of the same salary as I received when I first joined the Force in 1877; and (4) that I never left the Force to suit my own convenience, but that I was compelled to leave on each and every occasion. In consideration of the treatment which I have been subjected to, extending over a period of several years, I would respectfully ask that I be promoted to the rank of first-class constable, and that my service count from the 1st December, 1877, and that such other compensation and redress be granted me as may be considered just and reasonable. My reason for not forwarding this application previous to this was because I was desirous of giving you an opportunity of judging sufficiently as to my conduct and qualification as a constable.

Trusting that you will be so kind as to forward this for the favourable consideration of the Commissioner, accompanied by such recommendation as you may consider me worthy of while serving in your district.

THOMAS MAYNE, Third-class Constable, No. 579.

I should like now to read the report of Mr. Carew, who held the inquiry referred to. It is as follows:—

SIR,—

Resident Magistrate's Office, Dunedin, 12th December, 1881.

I have the honour to inform you that, in accordance with your memorandum of the 23rd ultimo, I have held an inquiry into the complaint of ex-Constable Mayne, and forward herewith the notes of statements made by him, his witnesses, and those called by the Police Department. There is considerable conflict in the evidence as to whether Constable Mayne was present outside the Queen's Theatre when a disturbance commenced there. Sergeant Bevin is the only person who says that he was there. Constable Mayne denies it, and his three witnesses bear out his statement to some extent. There certainly was a disturbance which extended from a passage to outside the theatre, and Constable Mayne makes an untrue statement on page 2 of his letter where he denies that there was any disturbance outside the theatre. As to the charge of neglect in omitting to secure the attendance of a boy named Ouiss as a witness at the Police Court, Sergeant Bevin says he instructed Mayne to secure Ouiss as a witness, and to ascertain his whereabouts from Goldsmith. Mayne only admits that he was told to inquire for Goldsmith, and says that Sergeant Geerin subsequently told him to proceed no further with his inquiries. Sergeant Geerin states he only told Mayne not to leave his beat to look for Goldsmith; but subsequently, after Mayne came off from his beat, he told Mayne he had looked for but could not find Goldsmith, and that he (Mayne) must get up his case as well as he could. Mayne appears to have taken no further action in the matter. I cannot find any evidence of Mayne having been wanting in courage; but in my opinion he was negligent in not carrying out his instructions to obtain evidence for the Police Court, and he is either very untruthful, or deficient of sufficient intelligence to interpret and understand instructions that are given to him.

I have, &c.,

E. H. CAREW, R.M.

On the 24th February, 1893, I wrote to Inspector Pardy, "Please inform Constable Thomas Mayne that his statement of the 2nd instant has been laid before the Hon. the Defence Minister as requested, who has directed me to state that he (Mr. Seddon) declines to reopen the matter of which the constable complains, after the lapse of time that has taken place since it was investigated.—A. HUME, Commissioner." From these papers it will be seen that Mayne, instead of being exceptionally treated, appears to have a grievance.

365. *The Chairman.*] He was subsequently taken on to the Police Force from the Armed Constabulary?—Yes, and he is still in the Force as a third-class constable.

366. *Colonel Pitt.*] He applied to be made a first-class constable; what was done about that?—He was not promoted. Here is the minute I wrote: "Inspector Pardy,—I regret I cannot re-open this case. Inspector Weldon has long since left the service, and Sergeant-major Bevin is dead. The constable in March, 1890, did not ask for a re-opening of the case, but asked to be re-appointed to the police, which the then Commissioner complied with. The case cannot therefore now be reopened.—A. HUME. 28/1/93."

367. *Mr. Taylor.*] I wish to know whether it is not generally recognised that a man who has been told off to do plain-clothes duty—that is practically detective duty—is being rewarded for intelligence and smartness, and whether men do not look forward to it?—I should think they did, though some of them have a grievance that it is very expensive, and so on.

368. It follows a good record very often?—Yes.

369. I should like to ask now whether this man Mayne does not, as a matter of fact, rank as a fourth-class detective?—No, he simply ranks as a plain-clothes constable without any allowance, pay, or standing as a detective.

370. He is not in the detective branch?—No.

371. Do you not classify him with the detective branch of the service?—No.

372. I would like to ask what special circumstances there were in connection with his being made a plain-clothes constable, because Stipendiary Magistrate Carew said he was lacking in intelligence?—He applied for employment in the detective branch of the Police Force at Dunedin on the 14th March, 1895, and the Inspector sent it up to me on the next day with this minute: "The Commissioner.—I forward you this application of Constable Mayne for transfer to Invercargill as detective, but in justice to the service I cannot recommend it. It is possible after some training he may develop into a detective, but to place him at an important station like Invercargill would be very detrimental to the service and unfair to the public who look to the police for protection.—WILLIAM S. PARDY, Inspector. 15/3/95." He was not sent there, but was put on plain-clothes duty to work up, as Mr. Pardy suggests he might possibly work up to a detective.

373. Had you no other man among the 494 members of the Force who was more qualified than Constable Mayne for that particular duty?—I would not say I had not.

374. Was he not, in fact, subject of special ministerial recommendation?—Yes; in fact, I am sure it was a member of the House who recommended him specially.

375. *Colonel Pitt.*] Was it a Minister who interfered for his promotion?—The Minister told me to order him to do plain-clothes duty.

376. *Mr. Taylor.*] Might I ask whether the Minister saw Inspector Pardy's report?—Yes.

377. *Colonel Pitt.*] Colonel Hume also said that a member of the House urged the Minister to do this?—Quite so.